



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,147	04/08/2004	Gregory Richard Hintermeister	ROC920030375US1	8969

7590 11/14/2006

Grant A. Johnson  
IBM Corporation  
Dept. 917  
3605 Highway 52 North  
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
----------

LEVINE, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/821,147

Applicant(s)

HINTERMEISTER, GREGORY  
RICHARD

Examiner

Adam Levine

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. **Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that they fail to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. These claims are omnibus type claims. Claims 8 and 16 recite, "the problem comprises a function." Claims 5 and 13, from which claims 8 and 16 depend, recite in relevant part, "finding an on-demand task associated with the problem...." As explained in the specification an on-demand task in this context is a function that would replace another function. As a result dependent claims 8 and 16 read together with independent claims 5 and 13 are directed to "a function associated with the function." As a result it cannot be determined to what the claims are specifically directed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. **Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material. The claim is directed at a signal-bearing medium encoded with instructions not claimed as embodied in a computer-readable medium and not implemented in a computer apparatus. The phrasing makes clear that it is the signal-bearing medium encoded with instructions itself that is being claimed rather than the method embodied thereon or its embodiment within a medium that is part of a functioning system or apparatus.

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention that permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer that permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions. MPEP 2106 IV B 1 (a).

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs that impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data. Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se. Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional

descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.

Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

These particular claims, by way of illustration, could be directed to a printed page with instructions written thereon.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being rejected by Teper (US Patent No. 5,815,665).**

Teper teaches all the limitations of claims 1-20. For example, Teper teaches a method for brokering tasks that comprises providing appropriate tasks to users, with said tasks meeting the needs presented by specific contexts and problems. Teper further discloses:

- determining a problem from a context: problem comprises a condition, problem comprises a function (see at least fig.6, column 3 line 65-column 4 line 14).
- finding an on-demand task associated with the problem: (see at least fig.6, column 3 line 65-column 4 line 14, column 8 lines 7-19; column 9 lines 38-49).
- presenting a notification of the availability of the on-demand task: displaying an icon indicating that the on-demand task is available (see at least figs.2-4, column 3 lines 58-64, column 4 lines 15-27, column 9 lines 38-49. Please note: The displayed notification is the functional element. The image used, whether it is an icon, symbol, word, or other form, is descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the recited steps of the method. Because it has no functional role in the method it is non-functional descriptive material. This descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381 , 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983). MPEP 2106).
- passing the context to the on-demand task: in response to a selection of the icon (see at least abstract, figs.2,6; column 3 line 65-column 4 line 14, column 9 lines

Art Unit: 3625

38-49, column 18 line 39 – column 19 line 10. Please note: see above with regard to the nonfunctional descriptive nature of the icon. The functional element here (or the method step) is interpreted as the means for choosing or choice of the displayed notification corresponding with the on-demand task.)

- determining whether a use of the on-demand task is available: (see at least abstract, figs.2-6, column 3 lines 58-column 4 line 14; column 9 lines 38-49).
- determining whether a user is authorized to use the on-demand task: (see at least abstract, figs.2-3,6; column 2 lines 31-48, 57-column 3 line 30; column 9 line 61-column 10 line 29); whether a user is authorized to purchase a use of the on-demand task (see at least abstract, figs.2,4-5; column 1 lines 41-49)
- processing a purchase of a use of the on-demand task: (see at least abstract, figs.2,4-5; column 1 lines 41-49).
- a processor, memory encoded with instructions (see at least abstract, fig.4, column 1 lines 13-23, column 2 lines 57-67, column 5 lines 26-32, column 26 lines 40-46 (claim 45)).

Pertaining to apparatus and system claims 5-8 and 13-16, respectively

Rejection of claims 5-8 and 13-16 is based on the same rationale as noted above.

Pertaining to signal-bearing medium claims 9-12

Rejection of claims 9-12 is based on the same rationale as noted above.



**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam Levine whose telephone number is 571.272.8122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00 Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on 571.272.6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Adam Levine  
Patent Examiner  
November 4, 2006

  
JEFFREY A. SMITH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800